

A group of senators led by staunchly anti-Communist Thomas Dodd of Connecticut have taken the unusual, and unfortunate, step of asking that a pamphlet released by the Senate International Security Subcommittee be "burned."

The report, entitled "The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda," is on the whole one of the most brilliant and informative analyses of Communist subversion and propaganda available, and is particularly eloquent with re-

## At Home

gard to the strategic consequences of the so-called "peace" movement. Its author, Mme. Suzanne Labin, is one of the world's outstanding experts on international Communism.

Now Mme. Labin's analysis is to be suppressed. According to the *Washington Post*, Sen. Dodd has said it "can be taken for granted" that copies of the report as yet undistributed will be burned or by some other method destroyed. Columnist Holmes Alexander later disclosed that the booklet would be done away with by "the pulping process."

Complaints against the booklet were principally two: First, that it described the American Friends Service Committee as "a transmission belt for the Communist apparatus," and made derogatory references to the Ford Foundation and the 1963 nuclear test-ban treaty; second, that the report was released on the authority of chairman James O. Eastland (D., Miss.) without being cleared by other Subcommittee members. Dodd, who is Subcommittee vice chairman, therefore insisted the booklet be withdrawn.

On the matter of clearance, Dodd's point would seem to be well taken. Ordinary logic would suggest committee documents be circulated to members before release by the chairman, although this is by no means uniform practice among other committees in Washington. On the substantive virtues of destroying the report because of its remarks about the Friends Service Committee and other pacifist manifestations, the justice of Dodd's position is somewhat more ambiguous.

In 1956, Eugene Lyons reviewed an AFSC report on conditions in the Soviet Union by saying: "The pamphlet is as cold-blooded and cynical a document as has come to my attention in many a year and I am something of a connoisseur of the literature of pro-Soviet apologetics." Whether this sort of thing constitutes acting as a "transmission belt for the Communist apparatus," however, is a delicate question which should be answered by appropriate agencies of the government. If the assertion is not supported by a full assessment of the facts it should be stricken from the report.

But that is quite a different step from "burning" the report as a whole.

Concerning the Ford Foundation, the report states: "This foundation financed a very bourgeois visit to the United States for the editor of the Hindi paper, *Blitz*, one of the most viciously pro-Soviet organs, and an Italian novelist who writes for pro-Communist magazines, who lost no time in publishing violent diatribes against the United States." Do the protesting senators allege that statement to be false? If not, there is no good reason it should not be in the report. If so, and if their assertion is correct, then the recommended step again would seem to be, not "burning," but excision.

On the matter of disarmament and the Moscow Treaty, the report says that if "the Soviets were miraculously to destroy all their armaments tomorrow . . . they would still attack us with their fantastic apparatus of political warfare, by which they can conquer countries from within by subversion, conspiracy, and propaganda, without firing a shot. The Soviets possess both a sword and a virus while the free world has only a sword. So if both discard their swords we would be killed by the Soviet virus."

There is much more in the report that, given wide dissemination, could neutralize the hysterical initiatives of pacifists, America-last-ers and cut-and-run diplomats. Particularly commendable is Mme. Labin's dissection of the psychological methods by which the Communists break down Western resistance, and the deeply implanted fallacies by which the West goes about the job of convincing itself it should surrender.

Consider these representative passages: "We have armed Berlin with atomic artillery which sits idle, yet not even one pound of plastic bombs has been found to blast, in one night, the wall of shame.

"Billions of dollars are furnished to strengthen the Japanese economy and its naval establishment, but not a finger is lifted to discourage the many Japanese teachers who are openly instructing school children that their first fatherland is the Soviet Union or Red China.

"We spend a million dollars for each horsepower of a Saturn missile . . . but we have not a cent for the courageous and hard-pressed anti-Communists of Indonesia, Panama, Madagascar, India, and Brazil. . .

"We prepare commando forces with the most prodigious transport speed and firepower, theoretically capable of intervening against Communist aggression anywhere in the world, and simultaneously pay the expenses of United Nations troops sent to destroy the anti-Communist friends of the West in Katanga.

"We crush the taxpayers to forge a steel breastplate with which to face the Kremlin on the battlefield, while in the struggle for minds we furnish television time to Communist-serving intellectuals whose wiles paralyze resistance to Communism."

Now, to eliminate one offending paragraph, Mme. Labin's excellent report is to be destroyed. A simpler approach would be to cut out the single paragraph, and reissue the remainder of the report. Why wasn't it used?